G. R. S. 59]

GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1906-07

~~491~~.

(Muzrai)

File No. 17

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Sannidhi Paricharike in the Sri Srikanteswaraswami temple at Nanjang

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Muzrai Department

Note

Subject :- Sannidhi Parichorike in the Sri Sreekanteswaraswami Temple at Nanjangud.

Last Reference :- Kasi Rangamma's petition no $\frac{139-145}{8}$ dated 29th August 1902, addressed to His Highness the Maharaja, which was received in this Office with the Private Secretary's memo no $\frac{99}{1}$ dated 1st September 1902, for report.

(a) No 1929 dated 15th June 1898

In June 1898 a petition (a) was received in this Office from one Sreekantiah stating that Rangamma

(the present petitioner) who was the Sannidhi Paricharaka in the Sri Sreekanteswara-Swami Temple at Nanjangud, was a man of immoral conduct, that he had been for his immorality dismissed in 1876, but was reinstated sometime after, and that he had still a concubine. In the petition it was also stated that Ranganna's son Venkataramagga was actually doing the Paricharaka work in the temple, but that he had also been dismissed from service on a previous occasion. This petition was referred (b) to the Dy Commr of the Mysore District for initial report.

(b) With the late Mugrai Secy's Rubkari No 1676 dated 21st June 1898.

2 In the personal enquiry held by the Amildar of the Nanjangud Taluk and Mr C. B. Lashmiri Rao, Mysore Assistant Commissioner of the Mysore District, the allegations contained in the petition against Rangamma proved to be true. Thereupon the Amildar, the Mysore Assistant Commissioner and the Dy Commissioner recommended (c) the dismissal of the said Rangamma, who was himself doing the work in the temple and not his son Venkataramayya as alleged in the petition. In recommending his dismissal, the Dy Commr ~~also~~ added that the

(c) In the Dy Comr's Rubkari No 2 dated 2nd July 1900.

4

people had a sort of a dislike to receive [illegible] (Tertha) from the said Rangauna.

3. Thereupon, the late Mugrai Secretary issued an order[d], directing his immediate dismissal for the reasons set forth in the Dy Comr's Rubkari on the subject, and observing that a good and competent man might be appointed in his stead.

4. Rangauna then began to petition to this office praying for his restoration to ~~his~~ the appointment, but all his petitions were rejected, and he was given Endorsements[e] shewing the reasons why he was dismissed.

(d) Rubkari no 18 dated 12th July 1900.

(e) no 127 dated 18-8-1900.
no 319 dated 15-9-1900
no 427 dated 23-11-1900
no 52 dated 11-8-1901

5. In April 1901, he applied to this Office praying that his appointment be given to his son-in-law. This petition was referred to the Dy Commissioner, who however, gave him an Endorsement* that the Vacancy had been filled up. Enclosing this Endorsement, he again presented a petition to this Office, but he was informed (f) that the matter could not be re-opened.

* No 47 dated 2nd May 1901.

(f) Endt no 52 dated 11th August 1901.

6 Hence the present petn to His Highness the Maharaja, wherein he prays that he may be restored to his hereditary appointment.

Submitted

Sd
4/9/02

From

7. From the Dy Comr's Endorsement to Rangamma, referred to in para 5 of this note, it appears that, on ~~the~~ his dismissal, the appointment ~~has been~~ was given to ~~one~~ Sreekantiah (the petitioner referred to in para 1 of this note) in pursuance of the Govt order no $\frac{7818}{454}$ dated 22nd September 1890.

This order relates to an Appeal brought by the said Sreekantiah against the order of the Dy Comr of the Mysore District, (~~Mr Michal John~~ Mr Meiklejohn) regarding the restoration of the Samidhi Parichoraka's appointment to him. The Appeal was heard and decided in 1890 by two Councillors messrs Thumboo Chettyar and Chentsal Rao, which

decision was communicated to the Dy. Commr. in Om. no 7818/454 dated 22nd September 1890.

The last para of this order runs thus :—

"

× × × × × ×

On his (Ranganna's) death or removal, there is no objection to the appointment being given to appellant (Sreekantiah) or his heirs".

Submitted

JS
8/9/02

Sub'd to the Dewan

The Petr was dismissed after careful enquiry & report. The appt has been given to one who was declared by a Committee of the Council to be entitled to the post of Petr under these circ

8

It does not appear that anything can be done for the Petur

This Petu has been received from H H the Maharaja's Private Secretary for report

[illegible] 10/9/02

R.S. [illegible]
11 9.02
5942

Submitted to His Highness. [illegible]

11. IX. 02 [illegible]

45

9

Submitted to His Highness the Maharaja.

~~For~~

Papers relating to the pe-tion of Kasi Ranjanna, of Nanjangode, about his claim to the Pari charike of Srikan-teswara Swamy temple

---

The petitioner may be informed that I decline to interfere on his behalf

KRW

12/9/02

7107

Endorse accs.
Let me see the terms
of it

12.IX.02

13/9/02

Draft subt

13/9/02

Note Continued :-

Flag A

8. His Highness' orders recorded on page 9 were accordingly communicated to the memorialist on the 15th September 1902, and a copy of the Endorsement was forwarded to the Dy Commissioner, enquiring at the same time as to who was actually doing the Samidhi Paricharike work.

8. Before a reply was received from the Dy Commr, Venkataramiah, son of the dismissed Paricharaka, Ranganna, submitted a memorial to Government stating that Mallur Sreekantiah was not appointed as the Samidhi Paricharaka in the room of his (petitioner's) father; that the said Sreekantiah, who was the Shanbhogue of some of the villages was since dismissed from Shan-

in connection with the embezzlement of Government money; and that the Paricharak's post had therefore been kept vacant since the dismissal of his father. He prayed therefore that, in consideration of the appointment having been in the uninterrupted enjoyment of his family for about 25 years since 1875, he might be appointed as the Sannidhi Paricharaka. This memorial was forwarded to the Dy Commr for favour of a detailed report together with his opinion —

9. In reply the Dy Commissioner, Mr B. K. Venkata Varadiengar, states, that ~~since~~ on the removal of Kasi Ranganna in 1900, Sreekantiah was appointed Sannidhi Paricharaka, but he did not enter upon his duties as he was holding a Revenue Shanbhogy and that he was subsequently dismissed in connection with the embezzlement of

Letter no 112/683 dated 17th Novr '03 Flag B

of Government money. He and the Amildar therefore recommends that as the Sunnidhi Parichorike post is a responsible one and as the incumbent of the Office has to be entrusted with valuable jewels of the temple, the post may be given to the petitioner Venkata-ramiah Son of Kasi Rangamma, who is since dead. They further state that the said Venkataramiah has been holding temporary appoint-ments in the temple and that he is fit for the Sunnidhi Pari-chorike post. The Amildar Mr C. Venkat Rao has further reported to the Dy Commissioner that Mullin Seekantiah, who had been dismissed from the Revenue Shambhogy on account of embezzlement of Govt money collected by him from the ryots, cannot be appointed to the Sunnidhi Parichorike post in the temple, where he has to deal with

valuable jewels. He strongly supports the claim of the petitioner Venkataramiah on the ground that his father held the post from 1871 to 1900.

10. Mullur Sreekantiah, who ~~has~~ has presented a petition to this office, states that, since his appointment to the Paricharike post, he did not enter upon his duties and prays that as he is not guilty, the ~~[illegible]~~ recommendation of the Amildar and the Dy Commr in favour of Venkataramiah may be set aside, by permitting him to do the Paricharak's duty. He refers to the Government order of 1890, which is quoted in para 7 of this note, and the original of which is herewith put up for reference. Flag C.

11. Para 5 (b), page 21 of the Revenue Rules runs thus:— Flag D

" If a Shanbhog or Patel
" be dismissed for treason, serious
" defalcation, or embezzlement of
" Government money, for levying

"an illegal cess from the ryots, or
" for fraudulent or clandestine
" enjoyment of Govt land, his
" Inam and privileges may be
" declared forfeited and
" pass away from his family.
" In such cases a divided
" brother or a cousin of the
" dismissed individual,
" having no joint interest
" with him, may succeed to
" the office and the rights
" attached to it, if considered
" in all respects fitted therefor
" and no objection exists to
" such an arrangement."

~~Submitted~~

JS
15/12/03

Enquire whether Srikantiah has any heir competent and willing to perform the duties of the Office. I have to make this enquiry because in the Council Courts Judgment it is stated that after the death or removal of Kasi Ranganaah

"there is no objection to the appointment being
"given to appellant (Srikantiah) or his
"heirs"—

[illegible] 15/12/03

Issue the draft put up

[illegible]
27/12/03

Note continued :—

12. The Dy Commr was accordingly requested to favour the Govt with his opinion in the matter of providing Sreekantiah's son with the Sannidhi Paricharak's appointment in the temple, provided he was competent, trustworthy and willing to attend to the temple duties himself. The Dy Comr's attention was also invited to the Council Court's judgement passed in 1890 (referred to in para 7 of this note), wherein it was stated that, after the death or removal of Kasi Ranganna, there was no objection to the appointment being given to Sreekantiah or his heir.

In

Letter no 222 dated 23rd Feby, '04.

9.

13. In reply, the Dy Commr, Mr B. K. Venkataveradiengar, again reports that Shanbhogue Srikantiah was removed from the office of Shanbhogue for having embezzled Govt money; that at his own request, his son Chandrasekhariah was appointed temporarily, as Shanbhogue of Govt villages, but that he has not yet been confirmed; that even if he is confirmed, he cannot manage the post of Sannidhi Parichorike, in addition to his own Shanbhogue duties, and that moreover he is reported to be not quite trustworthy and that he does not possess the qualification necessary for Sannidhi Parichorike in question.

Submitted to the Dewan

Es 1/3/04

Against Srikantiah it is reported that he embezzled Govt money

and was dismissed from the post of Shanbhog of Govt villages. As regards his son of Chandrasekhariah, it is stated that he is temporarily doing the duties of Shanbhog and has not yet been confirmed, that he is not quite trustworthy as an enquiry is being held into certain irregularities committed by him and that he does not possess the qualifications required for the Sannidhi Paricharika's post. Both these men have therefore to be excluded from consideration

On the other hand, there is nothing on record against Venkatramiah, son of Kasi Rangannah. He has performed the duties of Sannidhi Paricharak often and for long intervals and is fit for the post. His appt may therefore be sanctioned as recommended by the Dy Comr.

LL 15/3/04

6651
15.3.04

078340
Yes
16.3.04

Note continued :-

Pro no CA 2936 mug Fr 165-92 dated 21st March 1904.

Orders were accordingly issued appointing Venkataramayya as Sannidhi Paricharaka.

Chandrasekharayya, son of Sreekantayya (referred to in para 13 of this note) addressed a petition to this Office in April 1904, praying that either his father might be allowed to ~~continue~~ do the duties of the Sannidhi Paricharike or he (petr) might be made the Bhavanarddar. In reply, he was given an Endorsement that orders had already been passed intimating that neither he nor his father could ~~not~~ be given the post.

No 3300 dated 19th April 1904

He has presented a petition to His Highness repeating his claim, and the petn has been received in this Office for disposal, with the Private

20

Secretary's Om no 3495 dated

11th May 1904.

Subd for orders

[signature]
16/5/04

Subd to the Oswan.
The matter has already been settled and the petitioner may be informed that it cannot be reopened.

[signature]
17/5 '04

17797
18.V.04

[signature]
30.V.04

Recd
[signature]
1/6/04

4A

Note continued

The Dewan's orders on the preceding page were communicated to the petr. Chendrasekariah declining to re-open the question of his or his father Srikantiah's appointment to the Sannidhi Paricharike of the Sri Srikanteswaraswami temple at Nanjangud (Vide Endt no. 3827 of 4th June 1904). ~~His~~ Sreenivasayya's subsequent petition on the same subject was ordered to be filed

Petn no. 2709 of 14th Decr. 1905.

Srikantiah refd to has applied to this office praying for a re-view of the above order alleging that the appointment in question is hereditary and as such it may be conferred on him or his legal heirs.

~~Submitted.~~

May he be referred to the previous endorsement and informed that his future petitions on the same subject will receive no attention?

Submitted. Yes. Endorse as above

KS 7/2/06

8/2/06

8/2/06

22

Page ( )

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Note cnto

Endorsement was accordingly issued. Hethanumana Srikantiah has again petitioned this office praying that the appointment in question may be conferred either on him or his son who is fit for it, consistent with the orders passed by a committee of the Council. He complains throughout that there has been a failure of justice and solicits a second perusal of the records bearing on the subject. He further complains that Venkatanaiah, who has been appointed by Govt. to the Sannidhi Paricharike in the Nanjangud temple has illicit connections with prostitute, and is unfit to attend to the duties thereof; and further is unconnected with his family and as such his appointment is opposed to the Council decision.

no 1101 of D/ 24-8-1906
" 1252 D/ 31-8-1906

Muzrai Secretariat. File No of 190

~~records as directed by the Secretary is put up.~~

Submitted
JS
26/9/06

On the petition no 1101 dated the 17th August 1906 the Dewan has been pleased to call for the papers

Muzrai Secretary's Remarks.

File is herewith submitted as directed.

The preceding pages of this Note show how the case has proceeded from the commencement. The decision of the Council Committee which was to the effect that upon the death or removal of Kasi Rangannah the appointment might be given to the present petitioner Srikantiah or his heirs, could not be carried out because it was reported that the petitioner had been dismissed from a Govt Shanbhogship as he had embezzled Govt money and as regards his son Chandra Sekhariah it was reported that he was untrustworthy and that he was not competent for the post.

Sh. C

t became thus impossible to carry out

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Subd to the Dewan through the 2d Cr

Ananta Samr Rao
14/11/06

Seen
15/11/06

Subd to the Dewan Sahib who called for the papers.

29 24
17.11.06

16/11/06

The Dewan sees no reason to reopen the case

Bo
10/12/06

Rmd
10/12/06

Draft accordingly
11/12/06

Rft submitted.

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note continued

Orders were accordingly issued

Hethammana Srikantiah has again presented to the II^d Councillor another

no. 4365 Dy 23:3:07 review application. He complains that the order appointing him to the Sanniohi Parichari Keship ~~Carpathegarship~~ was passed by a Committee of the Council, and that the Acting Muzrai Superintendent passed a summary decision in the case on the Deputy Commissioner's report without hearing him in person. He represents that the post is hereditary and that some one unconnected with his family has been appointed to the post.

Submitted.

W 28/3/07 The petitioner was given several endorsements.

Refer him to former endorsements passed under the Dewans ord.

Ed 7/4/

Ed 7/4/07

Endt. Submitted AV 7/4/07

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note continued

An endorsement was accordingly issued to Hethammana Srikantiah rejecting his application as there were no grounds to re-open the case (Vide no. 3189 dated 19th December 1906).

He has presented to the IInd Councillor another review application praying that the records connected with his case may be sent for and the matter reconsidered in his presence in the Council.

(Paper under disposal) no. 5484 dy 4th June 1907.

The IInd Councillor has recorded on the petition "Please let me see the papers in this case

AN 5:6:07. Submitted with the entire File (The Verm: records relating to the case were all retd. to the Dy Commr. along with the Govt. order - No. camp A/2936 dy 21st March 1904).

The papers in this man's case

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

30

Page ( )

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

went up before the late Dewan and H H the Maharaja, and afterwards before the present 2d Councillor and the present Dewan. The decision was against the Petnr throughout.

480.

Subd to the 2d Cr / Ullmantalame Rao 5/6/07

Petn. may be rejected

[illegible] 6/6/07

Draft according [illegible] 7/6/07

AV [illegible] 7/6/07

Note continued.

The petition of Hethammana Srikantiah re the Sannidhe Paricharike of the Sri Srikanteswaraswamy temple at Nanjangud was again rejected (endorsement no. 6012 dated 24th June 1904).

no. 431 dt 27/7/07. (Paper under disposal). He has again petitioned this office praying for a reconsideration of the foregoing orders.

510 dt 1/8/1904. (Printed memorial) Submitted } The said individual has also memorialized H H the Maharaja praying for a reconsideration of the foregoing orders of Govt. The memorial has been referred in continuation for disposal. The chief contention of the memorialist is that the office of Sannidhi Paricharike is hereditary in his family & that although the Govt. (the Councillors) had decided that the post had to be

given to the memorialist, the Govt. (Muzrai Deptt) appointed Venkataramiah, overlooking the claims of the Petr. He prays that the hereditary post may be restored.

In his petn. no. 431 dy 27th July 1907, Hetthammana Sricantiah states that some enquiry is going on in the Taluk and Distt Offices on the petn. of Venkataramiah, and prays that those records might be sent for & perused which he says will throw light regarding his hereditary claim to the Office

Submitted
[illegible] 3/8/07

The Petr. Hetthammana Sreecantiah (also called Mulloor Sricantiah) has explained his case personally to me and bitterly complains that injustice

had been done to him. He says that he did not actually embezzle Govt. money while he was Shanbhogue but that he simply delayed to remit certain contribution money and was therefore asked to transfer his Shanbhognie Baraward in favour of his son Chandrasekhariah, that in consequence of the Council decision he ought to get the Sannidhi Parichariké appointment in the temple, on ~~[illegible]~~ that the latter's son - a boy of 4 years - might be appointed Barawarddar, so that the hereditary hug may not be lost to his family. He says also that certain enquiries are being held in the Dt. Office on the complaint Petn. of Venkataramiah the present Parichariky

Send the memorial & other Petns

File No. of 190· Muzrai Secretariat.

Since received to the Dy Commr. and request detailed report together with the entire records bearing on the subject

29/9/1907

AV

Dft Submitted AV 4/10/07.

Note continued

The memorial and other petitions of Srikantiah were accordingly forwarded to the Dy. Commr. Mysore Distt and that Officer has submitted a detailed report together with the vernacular record bearing on the Subject.

The Dy Commissioner's report gives a clear and Succinct account of the facts of the case. That officer reports that owing one Ramiah (peter's uncle) was the Paricharak barawarddar of the Sri Srikanteswara Swamy temple at Nanjangud, the pay of the office being Rs 1-3-0 per mensem; that Ramiah being convicted of theft was removed from Office in the year 1866; and that the office was vacant till 1871 when one Kasi Ranganna unconnected with the family of the dismissed Paricharak Ramiah, was appointed, Ramiah having been declared to have forfeited all his huk. He states that

36

in 1876 the then Muzrai Officer dismissed Kasi Ranganna as he was considered to have had criminal intercourse with prostitutes and was therefore untrustworthy and appointed Senkantiah (petitioner) in his place He further reports that on appeal from Kasi Ranganna, the appointment of Senkantiah was cancelled on the ground that he was related to the dismissed Ramiah and that the re-appointment of Kasi Ranganna was left to the discretion of the Dy Commissioner who at the request of Kasi Ranganna gave the appointment to Kasi Ranganna's minor son Venkatasubbiah and ordered the duties to be performed by some one appointed by Kasi Ranganna

The Dy Commissioner continues as follows:- Kasi Ranganna however conducted the duties himself on behalf of his minor son. In 1888-89 Venkatasubbiah was convicted

in a theft case not connected with the temple and sentenced to imprisonment. The place having thus become vacant, petitioner Srikantiah claimed the office. In the enquiry held in 1890, it was proved that Srikantiah was a divided member of the family of the late Huckdar Ramiah. The then Dy Commr ordered that Kasi Ranganna should continue to do the duties of the office and that on the death of Kasi Ranganna, the office may be given to Srikantiah. The Dy Commissioner further reports that Govt. in their decision agree with the Dy. Commr. and ordered that on the death of Kasi Ranganna or his removal there was no objection to the appointment being given to Srikantiah or his heirs; that on the death of Kasi Ranganna, in pursuance of the above decision,

Seikantiah prayed that he might be permitted to do the duty of Sannidhi Parichaarike but that the appointment of Venkataramiah son of Kasi Ranganna was sanctioned in Govt. Ben of the 21st March 1904. He further states that it is this post which the petitioner has been requesting to be restored to him and that the above facts disclose that the petitioner's grievances are real so far as the hereditary hak is concerned.

In the detailed report of the late Dy. Commr. Mr. Micklejohn on which the Council decision of the 12th September 1890 is based, it is stated that the petitioner's uncle Ramigh who held a share in the office prior to 1866 was convicted of theft of valuable jewels (Javahari) in the temple and sentenced to two years' (Slip A)

rigorous imprisonment and that after several claims set up by petitioner and his other uncle Ranganna, it was decided by Col. Pearse, Supt of Ashtagram Divn, that the heirs of Ramiah has lost all right to the office by reason of so serious a crime committed by him and that some one quite unconnected with his family should be appointed to the post. The appointment of Kasi Ranganna in 1841 and the subsequent facts are detailed in the previous pages. It is also reported that the post in question is an important and responsible one including among its duties, the possession of the Keys of the box containing jewels and Silver Vessels.

(Slip B) In the Council decision of 1890 referred to above, it is stated among other things, that " in the enquiry now

proves that the appellant (Seikantiah) was a divided member of the family of the late Hucksaer Ramiah." In the concluding portion, it is stated that " & in fact he (Kasi Ranganna) has been doing duties from 1841 with a short break in the middle and it would be hard to turn him out, but on his death or removal, there is no objection to the appointment being given to appellant or his heirs".

After the death of Kasi Ranganna, in pursuance of the foregoing orders, Seikantiah petitioned Govt. applying for the vacant post of Sannidhi Panicharike.

As regards Seeekantiah, it is observed from the vernacular records received under cover of the Dy. Commr's letter under reference, that he was the Shanbhog

of Mullur Shirka comprising 4 Villages yielding a revenue of Rs 9660-2-0, that he was negligent in his duties and that he constantly absented himself without permission in spite of warnings, thereby allowing the work to suffer. The Amildar

(Sup d) reports that the petitioner collected some contribution amounts due from ryots, that he failed to remit them to the Taluk Treasury; that there was no entry of the receipt of this amount in his "Khirdi"; that in the "ಶಿಸ್ತು ಸಂಶ್ರೆ" list presented during jamabandy, he had recorded that he collected only ½ the contribution amounts; but that on enquiry, the ryots produced receipts wherein he had acknowledged the receipt the full contribution amount; and that these were noted in the "Takrar T

He further states that Srikantiah is sickly and untrustworthy to discharge the responsible duties of [illegible] and that he was consequently removed from Office and his son Chendrasekariah was temporarily appointed as a tentative measure in his stead for a period of one year. The Amildar also states that even after the confirmation of Chendrasekariah, it is not possible for him to attend to the Panchanike work ~~as~~ in addition to Shanbhogue duties, that a very trustworthy ([illegible]) person should be appointed to the post in question, and that he is not in favor of recommending Srikantiah or his son. The Dy. Commissioner having reported that Chendrasekariah is not quite trustworthy and that he does not possess

(Slip D)

(Slip E)

(Slip F)

the qualification necessary for the post in question, in Govt order no 2936 dated 21st march 1904, which was passed on the subject, it was observed that neither Seikantiah nor his son could be appointed to the post and the appointment of Kasi Ranganna's son Venkataramiah was sanctioned as he was reported to be qualified ~~to~~ for the post of Sannidhi Parichanike, being also a proper hucksar and as his father was doing the duties thereof from 1841 to 1900 ie for about 29 years.

From the records now received, it is also observed that on the recommendation of the Amildar that Mahendrasekarial was young and energetic, and that he was doing his duties properly, he has been confirmed in Shambhog's appointment.

Submitted

44

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Muzrai Secretary's remarks:—

From the further report and re- received from the Deputy Commissioner, it does not appear that the orders already passed against the Petr. require any re-consideration. But, as the party is present here and bitterly complains of injustice having been done to him, he may perhaps be heard by the 2nd Commissioner in a day or two.

308 Subtd. to the 2nd Councillor) Chuntalama Rao

2/2/1908

I have heard Chendrasekharia son of Srikantiah without pronouncing an opinion on the merits of the case, I feel

46

Page ( )

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

I should not reopen the case disposed of by the late Dewan whose decision was concurred in by the present Dewan. Inform Pet that his case cannot be reopened.

[illegible]
11/2/08

Subd to the Dewan [illegible]
11/2/08

7992
12.2.08

A petition of 18 8.08 from the appellant Sri Kantaiya saying that Venkatramaiya the last holder died on the 10th inst, ~~is~~ received in the Dewan's office, is put up for any ~~[illegible]~~ action that may be considered necessary.

[illegible]
22/8/08

Received
24/8/08
Send the petn
~~D.D.C~~
Call for a
DC as to what heirs V
has F. what are

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. of 190

47

Serial
No.

To,

The Dy Commissioner, Mysore Distt

Docket no 996 dated 2d September 1908

Forwards the petition from Hethammana Srikantiah stating that Venkataramiah who was holding the Sannidhi Garicharike post in the Sri Srikanteswaraswamy temple at Nanjangud died on the 10th August 1908 and enquires, as to what heirs Venkataramiah has left and what are their qualifications for the post.

To,

The Same officer,

Docket no 1147 Dy 12-9-1908

Forwards in continuation the petition from Gauramma, widow of the deceased barawardar Venkataramiah praying that the appointment may be conferred on her.

From,

The Same officer,

Letter no 207 Dy 11-1-1908.

Reports that the deceased has left no heirs except his wife Gouramma, who requests that the baraward may be made out in

(Paper under 6 p.(e))

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—16-5 08

Serial No.

her name, her brother being appointed as Gumastha.

Flag G) In his report dated 5th novr 08 which goes fully into the facts of the case, the Amildar recommends that as already directed by Govt in their order of the year 1890, the vacant post may be conferred on Nanjundiah, Grand-son of Srikantiah, the duties being attended to by his Gumastha, after taking the proper security from him.

Flag B)

The previous pages of the office-note deals with the facts of the case at full length.

Submitted for orders

AW 25/1/09.

Attention is respectfully invited to the orders of the Second Councillor endorsed on pages 45 & 46 of this note. The last holder of the Sannidhi Paricharikê post having died leaving a widow behind him, Sreecantiah the huckdar claims the office now

Subtd for orders

AW 26/1/09 This are now matters ~~which~~ DS Cont's can dispose of. Mr DS Cont's may

Serial No.

himself [illegible] orders. The report is called for in August last before the order [illegible] the [illegible] Dept is passed

10381

Submitted to [illegible] Commissioner
[illegible]

26. 1. [illegible]

The matter may be left to the Dy Commr's disposal
[illegible]
27/1/09

[illegible]

[illegible] on 2 2 1909

[illegible]

7

Incorporate

Presented in person - Please let me see the papers in this case

To

The Honourable Council of the
Government of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

5484
4.6.07

Petitioner:- ... ... Mathavana Sreekantaiya.

Most Respected Sirs,

The petitioner begs to prefer this petition against the decision of the Huzaroy Secretary and begs to submit as follows:--

(1) The above petitioner is entitled to the post of Sannidhi Parichaika in the temple of Srikanteswara Swami at Nanjangude in accordance with the Government Proceedings No 7818/454 dated the 22nd September 1890

(2) In accordance with the above proceedings the petitioner was given the said post in 1900.

(3) In 1903 the then Amildar of Nanjangude reported to the Huzaroy Secretary that the petitioner was incompetent for the said post on the ground that he was guilty of misappropriation in his duties as Shanbhogue, and that another person quite unconnected with the family should be elected for the post.

(4) The said Amildar was wrong in his report because even granting that the Amildar was right in his reasoning he did not take notice of the fact that the petitioner's son was then competent

for

for the said post and that he had been actually appointed the Shanbhogue, in supersession of his father dismissed for the said misconduct.

(5) The Muzaroy Secretary without taking notice of the fact simply passed orders in accordance with the Amildar's report.

(6) Though the petitioner thereafter again and again applied to the Muzaroy Secretary to review his order with an impartial consideration the Muzaroy Secretary persists in passing the order.

(7) The Muzaroy Secretary has by his attitude shown that he is highly prejudiced against the petitioner.

(8) The petitioner thereupon appealed to this Honourable Council and the second Councillor was pleased to call the Muzaroy Secretary to forward the records.

(9) The said Muzaroy Secretary has not in accordance with the above order submitted the records but has again given the notice that no revision of his order could be effected.

(10) Neither the Amildar nor the Muzaroy Secretary has jurisdiction to pass an order contravening the orders of the Council.

(11) I pray this Honourable Council to call

for

for the records of my case and to kindly reconsider the matter in my presence.

The petitioner begs to remain,

Most Respected Sirs,

Your most obedient servant,

Bangalore,

4th June 1907.

Muz. 21]

Draft as per orders

ನಂ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

ಕಂಬಕ ಸಂತಿಕ ಲಾಯಿ ಪಿತ್ತಮ್ಮಕ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಂಠೇಶ್ವರಸ್ವಾಮಿಗೆ—

ಕಂಬಕ ಸಂತಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಂಠೇಶ್ವರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸಕ್ಷಿದ್ಧಿವರಿ ಚಾರಿಕೆ ಕೌಕರಿವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ,

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಕಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಜುಲೈ ಮಾಹೆ 4 ನೇ

ಮುಕ್ಕಂ 5484 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾವದಲ್ಲಿಯವ ಕೌಕರಿವಿಷಯವು ~~ಮೇ~~ ಮೇದಲೆ ನವರಗ್ಗೆಂಬಿ ಕಿಂದ ಆ ಪ್ರೊಲಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾಗಿ ಆ ಕಿಮನೆ ~~ಮೇ ಮೇದಲೆ~~ ಕಂ ನಂ 5038/27 4 04 ಗ್ಗೆಯ ಕ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಸಾದರ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಿಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂದ್ಧರಿಂದ ಕಿಮ್ಮ ಅಜ್ಞೆಯಕ್ಕುವಂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಿಕ್ಕೆ - ಕಿಳಿಯುವಿದು.

ಅಜ್ಞೆ ಮೂಲಾಂಶ ಸಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಿಕ್ಕೆ

By order,

Cr's order UL 13/6/07

Secretary

No. 601

1576/07

Copy to

The DC Mysore in Contr

GPB—1,000—18-6-06.

No. 292

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

~~The~~ Palace, Mysore, 30-7-190 7

570
1/8/07

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzroi Department, Bangalore, ~~for~~ in continuation of this Office No.2573 dated 14-5-06.

No. 141 of 07-08.

By Order,

I. C. S.

Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
H'S HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 88/1

Mysore 30th September 1907

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, to be transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department, Bangalore, for disposal

No. 457 of 07-08

By Order,

I. C. S.

Private Secretary

to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

Dft as per orders

[illegible] 17-1906

To,

The Dy Commr

Mysore Distt

Sir,

In continuation of this office no 6013 dated 24th June 1907 I am directed to forward herewith the marginally-noted petitions from Hethammana-Srikantiah of Nanjangud. The chief contention of the memorialist is that the office of Sannidhi Parecharike of the Sri Srikanteswara-Swamy temple at Nanjangud is hereditary in his family and that although the Govt. (the Councillors) had decided that the post had to be given to the memori

* no 431 dated 27:7:1907.
1507. —do— 28:9:1907.
" — 510 —do— * 1:8:1907
" — 1540 —do— 1:10:1907
1550 —do— 1:10:1907.
* addressed to H. H the maharaja

the Govt appointed Venkata-
ramiah, overlooking his claims.
He prays that the hereditary
post may be restored to him

2. In his petition no 431
dated 29th July 1904, Sreekantiah
states that some enquiry
is going on in the Taluk
and District Offices, on the
petition of Venkataramiah,
and prays that those records
might be sent for and
perused which he says will
throw light regarding his
hereditary claim to the office.

3 Further, the petitioner represents personally
~~personally represented to me~~
that he did not actually
embezzle Govt money,
while he was Shanbhogue,
but that he simply delayed
to remit some contribution
money and was therefore
to his

Shanbhognie Baraward in favor of his son Chandra Sekariah, that in of the Council decision he or his son Chandrasekhariah ought to get the Sannidhie Parichakike post in the temple; ~~that~~ or the latter's son — a boy of 4 years — might be appointed as Barawarddar, of the post in the temple so that the hereditary huk may not be lost to his family.

~~He adds that certain enquiries are being held in the Distt office on the complaint petition of Venkataramiah, the present Paricharak~~

4. I am directed to request that you will be good enough to enquire into the ma

and submit a detailed report on all the points noted above, together with the entire records bearing on the subject.

I have etc.

DOD) [signature] 6/10/04

Secretary

[signature] 6/10/04

MS F-17-1906

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

No. 431 [illegible] 29:7:07
— 1507 [illegible] 28:9:07
— 510 [illegible] 1:8:07
— 1540 [illegible] 1:10:07
— 1550 [illegible] 1:10:07

[illegible]

[illegible]

By order

[illegible] [illegible] 8/10/07
Secretary

4/12/07

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
MAIN SECRETARIAT

A.V.
Refer please
Please continue note
by 7/12/07

~~189~~ 1907 08

FROM
M. Kantaraj Urs Esq B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
L Anantasawmi Rao Esq B.A.
Secy to Govt. Mez. Deptt

Dated 5th Decr 1907

Despatched

Received

General No. 5
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Submits report on the petition of Hettamma-na Srikantiah of Nanjangud re Sannidhi Paricharike.

233

No
File

Office of the Deputy Commissioner.

Mysore District.

4th December 1907
5

To

L. Ana t_asami Rao Esq., B .A.

Secretary to Government

Muzrai Department.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No,1341 dated the 10th October 07, forwarding for report with entire records the marginally noted petitions (herewith retransmitted) from Hettammana Srikantiah of Nanjangud regarding the office of sannidhi paricharake of the Sri Srikanteswara swami temple at Nanjangud, I have the honor to state as follows:-

No	Date
31	27.7.07
07	28.9.07
10	1.8.07
40	1.10.07
Returned to Muz. secy. with No 1870	
11/2	11.07
550	1.10.07

2. One Ramiah (petitioner's uncle) was the barward parichark of the Sri Srikanteswara swami temple at Nanjangud. The pay attached to the office was Rs. 1-3-0 per mensem. Ramiah was convicted of theft and removed from office in the year 1866. The office was vacant till 1871 when one Kasi Ranganna unconnected with the family of the dismissed parichark Ramiah, was appointed, Ramiah having been declared to have forfieted all his Huk. In 1876 the then Muzrai Officer dismissed Kasi Ranganna as he was considered to have had criminal intercourse with prostitutes and was therefore untrust worthy and appointed Srikantiah (petitioner) in his place. On appeal from Kasi Ranganna the appointment of Srikantiah was cancelled on the ground that he was related to the dismissed Ramiah and the reappointment of Kasi-Ranganna was left to the discretion of the Deputy Commissioner who at the request of Kasi Ranganna gave the appointment to Kasi Ranganna's minor son Venkatasubbiah and ordered the duties to be performed by some one appointed by Kasi Ranganna.

3. Kasi Ranganna however conducted the duties himself on behalf of his minor son. In 1888-89 Venkatasubbiah was convited in a theft case not connected with the temple and sentenced to

imprisonment. The place having thus become vacant petitioner Srikantiah claimed the office In the enquiry held in 1890 it was proved that Srikantiah was a divided member of the family of the late Huckdar Ramiah.

4. The then Deputy Commissioner ordered that Kasi Ranganna should continue to do the duties of the office and that on the death of Kasi Ranganna the office may be given to Srikantiah.

5. Government in their decision dated 14-9-90 (vide copy enclosed) agreed with the Deputy Commissioner and ordered that on the death of Kasi Ranganna or his removal, there was no objection to the appointment being given to Srikantiah or his heirs.

6. On the death of Kasi Ranganna ~~in~~ and in pursuance of the above decision Srikantiah prayed that he may be permitted to do the duties of Sannidhi Panichark but Government in their Proceedings No. A dated 21st March 1904 (vide copy enclosed) sanctioned the appointment of Venkataramiah son of Kasi Ranganna under the circumstances stated therein.

7. It is this post which the petitioner has been requesting to be restored to him.

8. The file of vernacular records relating to the transfer of the shanbhogi barward to the petitioner's son Chendra Shekariah and the embezzlement of Government money is herewith submitted for favour of reference. It will be observed therefrom that the petitioner was not only negligent in his work but also delayed remitting to the Treasury certain Government money collected by him in the shape of contribution etc and that therefore he was dismissed from his office of shanbhogi, his son Chendra Shekariah being appointed and confirmed in his stead (vide No. 586/605 dated 6-11-06)

9. The above facts disclose that the petitioner's grievance~~s~~ are real so far as the hereditary huk is concerned.

10. The file of vernacular records ~~having~~ bearing on the subject

received

Received with the Sub Division Officer's yadi No. 84/286 dated 23-10-07 is herewith submitted for reference.

7 11 07

I have the honor to be

Sir,

your most obedient servant

[signature]

Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

[signature]

131
27.7.07

Presented by Sukhanlal in person Registered and put up before the Court on the Office Note
26/7/07

Vol.

[illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible] 2007 [illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

454
818

[illegible] 27 [illegible]

II [illegible] 2001 [illegible]

III [illegible] 2001 [illegible] 2003 [illegible] 79 [illegible]

[illegible]

IV [illegible] 1903 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21-3-1904 [illegible]

[illegible] 8-8-1902 [illegible] 37 [illegible]

V 1904 [illegible] 24 [illegible]

[illegible] 19-4-1904 [illegible]

[illegible] 14-6-1904 [illegible] 3827 [illegible]

VI [illegible] 27-1-07 [illegible]

Cover

OFFICE OF T...

Mu...

No. 3827

Dated 4th June 1904

MYSORE GOVERNMENT 1567

ENDORSEMENT granted to Chendrasekharazza, son of Srikantiah late Sannidhi Paricharaka, in the Sri Srikanteswaraswami temple at Nanjangud, in reply to his Petition Registered No 212/2796 dated 21th March 1904, addressed to H H the Maharaja, praying that he or his father might be appointed to do the duties of the Sannidhi Paricharike in the said temple.

Petitioner is informed that the question having been carefully considered by Government and their decision intimated to him in their Endorsement No. 3300 of the 19th April 1904, they decline to re-open the matter. The petition is accordingly rejected.

By. Order,

Bangalore

M. Shamaraoo

Ag. ~~Deputy~~ Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
1567
20.7.07
GENERAL SECRETARIAT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 26-7-97 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21-3-1997 [illegible]

[illegible] 22-9-08 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
141
29 JUL 1907
TO H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

To

H. H. SREE KRISHNARAJA WADEYAR

BAHADUR, G. C. S. I.,

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

THE HUMBLE MEMORIAL OF HETHAMMANA SRIKANTIAH OF NANJANGUD

RESPECTFULLY SOWETH :—

1. That the post of the *Sannidhi Paricharika* of the famous temple of Nanjangud was held by hereditary right by the members of his family till 1866 when the memorialist's uncle Ramiah was on duty. He was removed from his place owing to misconduct on his part. In 1871 the post was conferred on one Kasi Ranganna a man unconnected with the memorialist's family. Your Highness' humble memorialist petitioned to the Government, representing that as he was undivided member of the last incumbent he should not be made to suffer for the fault of the last incumbent.

2. In 1876 the above-named Kasi Ranganna was dismissed from the post for criminal intercourse with the dancing girl attached to the temple and also as quite untrustworthy to hold the post and Your Highness' humble memorialist's claim was recognized and he was appointed to the post in 1876.

3. But in 1878 on the petition of Kasi Ranganna through his minor son Venkatasubbiah, praying that his dismissed father's post may be conferred on him and that the duties attached to the post may be got done by substitutes the memorialist was removed from office and the post conferred on Venkatasubbiah.

4. Venkatasubbiah attained majority, but by the time he was to enter upon duty he was convicted for theft in 1889.

5. At this time Your Highness' humble memorialist represented to the the Government, the injustice of the order of the Muzrai authorities and it was not till 1890 that the Government decided to hear both parties when the then Chief Secretary Mr. T. Ananda Rao having considered the claims of both parties decided in No. 7818—454, dated 22nd September 1890, (copy enclosed for kind perusal) that the post of the Sannidhi Paricharika to be continued in the name of Kasi Ranganna till his death or dismissal and to be given to your humble memorialist; that is, Kasi Ranganna's fault was condoned.

6. In the year 1900 the said Kasi Ranganna was once more found guilty and dismissed and in accordance with the decision of the Chief Secretary the post was conferred on Your Highness' humble memorialist. The memorialist being than a Shanbhogue represented that he would get the duties of the office done through a substitute if it was not possible for the authorities to appoint his son to the post, for a time till the memorialist could arrnage to transfer the Shanbhogueship to his son and undertake to do the duties personally. This was approved and the memorialist had the duties performed through his substitute till 1903 when he offered to enter upon the duties personally.

7. At this time Venkataramiah the 1st son of the dismissed Kasi Ranganna petitioned to the Muzrai Department, praying that the said post be given to him. The Muzrai authorities disregarding the decision of the Government, referred to above and overlooking the memorialist's claims appointed Venkataramiah by removing the memorialist from the same, without any fault in him.

8. From the above, Your Gracious Highness may be pleased to see that undeserved injustice has been done to the memorialist by the Muzrai authorities and he therefore humbly prays that justice may be done to him and the heriditary post may be restored to the memorialist and his family.

29-7-07

K. N. & Co., Prs., Mysore.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
UJERAI SECRETARI

[illegible]

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
MYSORE SPORTS

19/8/08

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

II [illegible]

III [illegible]

IV [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22.10.9[illegible]

[illegible]

818
454

[illegible]

[illegible] 22 9 9[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

It is a fact that the said
Venkataramana died at Nanjangud
on 10th August 1908
[illegible]
3rd class [illegible]

Dft as per orders

Muz 1 A] Mus, E 17-1906

190

From

To

The Dy Commr

Mysore Distt

Dated

Despatched 2 7 06

Received

General No.
No. 14

Enclosure No. 2

Adverting to his letter no 233 dated 5th December 1904 reporting on the claim for the Sannidhi Paricharike post ~~of~~ the Sri Srikanteswaraswamy temple at Nanjangud, has the honor to forward herewith petition registered no. 888 dated 18th August 1908 from

GPH—3000—21-7-03

Hethammana Srikantiah

of Nanjangud ~~representing~~ stating

that the office holder

Venkataramiah died

on the 10th instant.

The Dy. Commr is

requested to report

as to what heirs

Venkataramiah has left

and what are their

qualifications for the

post.

By order,

CSB

Dbt

for Secretary

[illegible] 28/8/08

To [illegible] in [illegible]

[illegible] 4/9/08

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
1007
4/9/08
HUZUR SECRETARIAT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1908 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 21-3-1904 [illegible]

[illegible] 10-8-08 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Mus 1 A]

190

From

To

The Dy. Commr.
Mysore District

Dated

Despatched 12.9.08.

Received

General No. 1167.
No.

Enclosure No. one.

In continuation of this office docket no. 996 dy 2d September 1908, has the honor to forward herewith petition regd. no. 1004 dated 4th idem from Gauramma of Nanjan gud praying that the vacant post of Panicharike of the Sri

any temple

Nanjangud, held by her deceased husband, may be conferred upon her, the duties appertaining to the post being performed by a Gumastha to be nominated by her. The Dy Commissioner is requested to expedite the submission of the report already called for on the subject.

By order,

G.
11.9.1908

for Secretary

~~Revenue and Rev. Depts.~~

11/9/08

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

By Order,

[illegible] 11/6/08

for Secretary

1338
30.7.08

Reply V.S. ... 27/7/08

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Reminder to Dy. Commr. submitted for approval.

[illegible]

[illegible] 24/9/
[illegible] 1364 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1904 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Records.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

D578

1908-09
Muz F 17-1906

From
M. Kanlaraj Urs Esq., B.A.
Dy. Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To
K. S. Chendrasekharia Esq., B.A. B.L.
Secy. to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore, Gen. & Rev. Depts.
Muzrai Branch

Dated 11th Jany 09

Despatched

Received

General No. 207
No.

Enclosure No. 1 file

Refer
ag
continue note & orders
&
by 15/1/09

Subject

Submits report on the petition of Gowram-ma re Sannidhi Paricharike in the Sri Srikanteswara Swami temple at Nanjangud

No. 207
Enc. No. 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore/Camp 11th January 1909.

To

K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq., B.A. B.L.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT

OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Muzrai Branch.

SIR,

Adverting to your docket No. 996 dated 2.9.08 and subsequent two dockets noted on the margin enquiring what heirs Venkataramiah has left and what their qualifications are for the vacant post of Sannidhi Paricharike in the Sri Srikanteswara Swami temple at Nanjangud, I have the honor to submit herewith the file of vernacular records received with the Sub Divisional officer's yadast No. 112/519 dated 15/21.12.08 and to state that the deceased is reported to have left no heirs except his wife Gowrammia who requests that the baraward might be transferred to her name, her brother being appointed Gumasta

1447 dated 12.9.08
144 " 3.11.08

(Flag x

The amildar reports that as the petitioner Srikantiah is the Hukdar, the baraward may be transferred to the petitioner's grandson's (son's son) name

a

a gumasta being appointed to look after the duties

The petitions received with the dockets under reply are herewith retransmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

[illegible]
Deputy Commr
Mysore District

B.A

G.R.S. 29A]

190 .

From

Secy. to the Govt of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy. Commr
Mysore Distt.

Dated

Despatched 1. 3. 09.

Received

General No.
No.

ENCLOSURE No.

Adverting to his letter no. 207 dt 11-1-1909 reporting on the petition from Gauramma regarding the Sannidhi Panchavitti in the Sri Srikanteswaraswamy temple at Nanjangud, has the honor to state that under recent orders of Govt. re-organizing the Muzrai Deptt., the matter is for disposal by the Commissioner himself

27 The

X. No. G 1600-39
G.M. 1-08-2
27th Septr. 1908

accordingly
permit returned.

By order
D(ad) Dir Secretary
[illegible] 29.1.09

Sudh Apartes
B.O.
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 29.1.09

No. 921 / 17-06 — 6.2.09.

మృ. సు. రా. గవర్నమెంటు జనరలు వరిపిస్సు.

సిక్తి ఖరి యివరకు చేరి యిందా.

సంజనగూడ తిరుగుతున్న శ్రీ శ్రీ కాంతేశ్వర స్వామి దేవస్థానపు లేఖలు సన్నిధి పరిచారకు పేరు కలరాం మృత్యుకరాలుంగ సారమ్మగా

సద్రి కౌకరి విషయమాని కిమదాగా రినేజాయిక్ మా ~~తిక్కేంద~~ 1007 గేకాంగారు అనుమత్తా యిదేవిషయమాని తీక్షారవారాదకల్పిద రిషేలుకు సరుపారాంగారి సలాయ్యా —

సద్రి విషయమదవ్వవస్తే తీక్షారవార అధికారక్కే ఇళపట్టురువదరాద, క్రమవరికి వ్వవస్తే మాడకార్డ ఇస్తే తీక్షారవరికే ~~అలాయదా~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ తెలుయువదా.

By order
(Sd.) [signature]
For Secretary
29.1.09

No. 922
17-06.

Similar endt. to Hethamana Srikantiah with ref. to his petition no. 888 dt 18-8-1908.

By order
(Sd.) [signature]
For Sec.
29.1.09